

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-32 are pending, claims 1, 9, 14, 16 and 23 having been amended and claims 28-32 having been added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner indicated that, in claim 1, line 11, it is allegedly unclear if the computer referred to by "a computer", is the same computer as the, "a computer", referred to in line 3 of the same claim. Similarly, the Examiner indicated that each recitation of "computer user" is allegedly indefinite because it is unknown to which computer, of the potential plurality of computers, is being used by the user.

Applicants amended claim 1 to change "computer user" to -- user of a first computer --, to indicate that step 1 is receiving a plurality of data feeds into a second computer, and to change the step of "displaying on a computer screen" to -- displaying on a screen --.

The Examiner further indicated that the term "immediately" in claim 14 is allegedly a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. Applicants amended claim 14 to delete the term "immediately".

Applicants submit that amended claims 1-15 are definite and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Canadian Patent 2,122,116 to Hazy et al. (Hazy). Applicants submit that amended claim 16 obviates the rejection.

Claim 16 recites a method of displaying investment information, comprising displaying one or more investment alerts on a computer display, wherein at least some of the alerts belong to a category reserved for most timely and relevant alerts, the at least some of the alerts being displayed in a manner indicating their membership in the category. This feature is described in the specification at page 13, line 18 through 22.

Hazy discloses a method permitting users to specify events or event sequences of interest within streams of events in financial, sports and other domains. The method allows the user to specify what actions are to be taken when the specified event occurs. Actions are executed when

triggers, which are set by the user, are activated. An action may be buying or selling of a stock at a specific price, sending an E-mail message to a designated group, or sending an alert signal to an individual. Hazy, however, does not disclose the previously recited feature of claim 16.

Because Hazy does not disclose each and every limitation of claim 16, Applicants submit that claim 16 is not anticipated by Hazy and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15 and 17-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hazy. Applicants traverse the rejection to claim 5 and submit that the amendments to the remaining claims obviate the rejection.

Claims 1-15 recite a computer-implemented method of providing investment information to a user of a first computer, comprising displaying on a screen associated with the first computer one or more alerts that have been set for an investment selected by the user of the first computer, wherein at least some of the alerts belong to a category reserved for most timely and relevant alerts, the at least some of the alerts being displayed in a manner indicating their membership in the category.

As discussed previously, with respect to claim 16, Hazy does not disclose or suggest such a feature.

Claims 17-22 recite the previously discussed limitation of claim 16 and are patentable over Hazy at least for the reason discussed above regarding claim 16.

Claims 23-27 recite a system for displaying investment information comprising one or more server computers, wherein the one or more server computers perform checking for a recent firing of an opposite alert rule of one of the alert rules indicated as being true in the truth table, and replacing the opposite alert rule, represented in the truth table with the one of the alert rules when an existence of the recent firing of the opposite alert rule is determined. This feature is described in the specification at page 21, lines 4 through 7.

Hazy says nothing about checking for a recent firing of an opposite alert rule of one of the alert rules indicated as being true in a truth table. Consequently, Hazy does not disclose or suggest replacing the opposite alert rule with the one of the alert rules when an existence of a recent firing of the opposite alert rule is determined.

Further, Applicants submit that claim 5 recites that the nonquantitative data items compared in the comparing step comprises one or more keywords in a news report. Hazy does not disclose or suggest such a feature.

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that claims 1-15 and 17-27 are patentable over Hazy and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

New claim 28 recites a computer-implemented method of providing investment information to a user of a first computer, comprising displaying on a screen associated with the first computer a display of information including one or more alerts flagged as footnote-type indicators, the alerts having been set for an investment selected by the user of the first computer. This feature is described in the specification at page 17, lines 18-28. Hazy does not disclose or suggest displaying footnote-type indicators.

New claim 29 recites a method of displaying investment information, comprising displaying at least one or more investment alerts on a computer display as a footnote-type alert on a display of information. This limitation is similar to the limitation of claim 28 discussed above, and is patentable over Hazy at least for the same reasons as claim 28.

New claims 30-32 recite a method of displaying investment information comprising displaying at least one or more investment alerts on a computer display in response to a step of specifying on the computer display an investment of interest. This feature is described in the specification at page 8, lines 24-29. Hazy does not disclose or suggest this feature. Hazy discloses that actions are executed when triggers are activated. The action may be sending an alert signal to an individual. Thus, Hazy may overload an individual with alert signals rather than displaying the one or more alert signals in response to specifying an investment of interest on a computer display.


New claim 31 and 32 further recite checking for the existence of a currently true misleading alert and suppressing the misleading alert. This feature is described in the specification at page 20, lines 23-28. Hazy says nothing about suppressing misleading alerts.

All rejections and objections having been addressed, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Applicants representative respectfully requests that the Examiner contact him at the number indicated below if he has any questions regarding this amendment, in order to further advance prosecution of this case.

The Patent Office is authorized to charge or credit any amounts deemed necessary to keep this application in force.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard C. Irving
Registration No. 38,499

RCI:jljg

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.
1001 G Street, N.W.
11th. Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Phone: (202) 508-9100
Fax: (202) 508-9299

Dated: September 6, 2001